

Sinclair Broadcasting's decision to force their stations to air an anti-Kerry documentary days before the election is a clear example of the dangers of media consolidation.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. But when large companies control the airwaves, we get more of what's good for the bottom line and less of what we need for our democracy. Instead of something produced at "News Central" far away, it's more important that we see real people from our own communities and more substantive news about issues that matter.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard.

It is my personal opinion, as an addendum to what I'm sure you recognize as the stock statement written above (To which I fully subscribe), that the viability of the FCC to be more than a mere rubberstamp of the monied is at stake here. Sinclair has blatantly used its licence to advertise for one candidate over another. This is a raw deliberate misuse of the airwaves which DO belong to the public; something you might wish to honor Mr. Powell!!!!

Sinclair should, at the least, be subject to a full investigation for this ethical abomination. I wish I could believe that you, Mr Powell, and the other Bush Administration Republican sycophants on the Commission would rise above your cronyism, but I do not have such faith. What Sinclair is doing is wrong. It ought to cost them their broadcast licenses. Not incidentally, I would be opposed to their endeavor even if I agreed in every way with the politics and philosophy their programming decision espoused.

This incident stinks. I leave it to you at the FCC to determine whether the stench of corruption surrounds you as well. I sincerely hope it does not and wish ALL of you the best.

Dave Rowland